

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner asserted that these inventions may be regarded as independent and distinct from one another if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP§ 806.05(f)).

In view of the new restriction requirement, Applicants withdraw their previous election without traverse, and herewith elect Group 1, claims 1-18 and 38-41, and further provisionally elect species B, *with* traverse.

Claims from Group 1 which read on the provisionally elected species B are:  
Claim 1-3, 6-10, 12-15 and 38-41.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's Restriction Requirement. To begin, the Examiner asserts that no claim is generic to the identified species. Applicants disagree and point out that claim 1 is clearly generic to all of the identified species. For example, each of the species identified by the Examiner represent variations in a structure and/or attribute of the support substrate of claim 1 which facilitates separation of the support substrate from the display substrate. The Examiner has exemplified species A by claim 5, species B by claim 6, species C by claim 11, species D by claim 12, species E by claim 13 and species F by claim 14. Each of the exemplary claims is dependent on independent claim 1 and includes the limitations of claim 1.

Second, in species B the Examiner has identified a recyclable substrate. Yet paragraph [38] of Applicants' disclosure indicates that a recyclable substrate may include, for example, such surface features as corrugation or an egg-crate surface, or include holes for removal by lift pins or an applied fluid (gas or liquid). Thus, species B is not mutually exclusive of species D, E or F.

As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the election requirement in the next subsequent Office Action, and continue prosecution of elected Group I, claims 1-18 and 38-41 together with one another.

Appl. No.: 10/613,972  
Amdt. Dated: 9/12/05  
Reply to Office Action of: 08/23/2005

Applicants believe that no extension of time is necessary to make this Response timely. Should Applicants be in error, Applicants respectfully request the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Response timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Kevin M. Able at 607-974-2637.

9/12/05  
Date

<p><b><u>CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION</u></b> <b><u>UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8</u></b></p> <p>I hereby certify that this paper and any papers referred to herein are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service, as first class mail, postage prepaid, addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:</p> <p><u>Kevin M. Able</u> <sup>Date</sup> <u>9/12/05</u> Kevin M. Able Date</p>
---

Respectfully submitted,  
CORNING INCORPORATED

Kevin M. Able

Kevin M. Able  
Registration No. 52,401  
Corning Incorporated  
Patent Department  
SP-TI-03-1  
Corning, NY 14831